



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/919,385

07/31/2001

Ronald F. Woestemeyer

PROSI100-1

3387

44654 7590 01/24/2008
SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP
1301 W. 25TH STREET
SUITE 408
AUSTIN, TX 78705

EXAMINER

OYEBISI, OJO O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3694

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,385

Applicant(s)

WOESTEMEYER ET AL.

Examiner

OJO O. OYEBISI

Art Unit

3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3694

DETAILED ACTION

In the amendment filed on 11/06/2007, the following have occurred: claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, 18-19, 21-24, 28, and 30-32 have been amended, and claims 1-36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (Hereinafter Anderson, US PAT 5,974,396) in view of Newswire (PR Newswire, "net.Genesis Announces Most Valuable Customer TM Segmentation Package." New York: Mar 22, 1999. p.g 1; 3 pages)

Re Claim 1: Anderson discloses a market analysis system comprising:

Art Unit: 3694

- A computer processor (FIG 3; Ref 64);
- A computer readable storage medium (FIG 3 Ref 64 "memory");
- A database stored on the computer readable medium comprising aggregate transaction data (Column 2 line 67-Column 3 line 7); and
- A software program stored on the computer readable storage medium executable by the processor to;
 - o Receive a set of transaction data from an electronic exchange (Column 2, lines 46-51);
 - o Store the set of transaction data in the database (Column 2 line 67-Column 3 line 7)
 - o categorize products and services from the aggregate transaction data into a standard pricing groups defined by one or more attributes (Column 3, lines 65-Column 4 lines 6; and Column 5 lines 55- 61), and
 - o Apply a statistical analysis to compare the products or services in a standard pricing group (i.e., Anderson teaches marketing analysis tools, such as conventional statistical analysis software packages, e.g. SPSS, Cognos Impromptu.TM., Cognos Power Play.TM, see col.6 lines 10-25, which can inherently be used to make products and services comparison).Anderson fails to explicitly disclose where the market transactions are conducted electronically via the Internet. However, Newswire makes this disclosure (i.e., Newswire discloses "net.Genesis Corp., the leader in e-business intelligence solutions for Internet enabled and Fortune 500 enterprise." Further disclosed is the MVC segmentation package that "empowers e-businesses to quickly identify their best and

Art Unit: 3694

worst customers." Information derived from MVC's sophisticated visitor segmentation model greatly enhances an e-business ability to gain a holistic view of their best and worst online customers." (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to include the teachings of Newswire to the disclosure of Anderson so that as e- businesses continue to proliferate, so too will the need to evaluate online sales and marketing initiatives. By utilizing Internet sales as well as traditional sales, the system of Anderson can have a more holistic view of customer purchasing information.

Re Claim 2: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the statistical analysis applied comprises at least one of a demand function analysis, a time series analysis, a correlation analysis, a request for quote analysis and an auction analysis (Column 10, lines 31-53)

Re Claim 3: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the software program is executable to store a set of results from the statistical analysis in an aggregate market database (Column 2 line 67-Column 3 line 7)

Re Claim 4: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the software program is further executable to communicate a set of results of the application of the statistical analysis to a user (Column 11, lines 6-19)

Re Claim 5: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the software program is executable to communicate the set of results in a format compatible with a revenue management software program (Column

Art Unit: 3694

4, lines 19-49; "encoding the data into digital format;" revenue management software in the form of membership cards and promotional literature such as coupons).

Re Claim 6: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the software program is further executable to communicate the set of results in response to a user request (Column 3 line 65-Column 4 line 6)

Re Claim 7: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the software program is further executable to return a summary of the set of transaction data (Column 3, lines 65-Column 54 line 6 "retrieve particular types of information..., queries may relate to determining purchasing behaviors of retail consumers.")

Re Claim 8: Anderson discloses a system for analyzing transactions at an electronic exchange comprising:

- A database storing a set of transaction data (Fig 1; Ref 26; Column 2 line 67-Column 3 line 7);
- A configuration manager operable to categorize products and services from the transaction data into a standard pricing group (Column 3, lines 65-Column 4 lines 6; and Column 5 lines 55-61);
- A market analyzer operable to apply a statistical analysis to one of the standard pricing groups to compare attributes of the products and services in the standard pricing group (FIG 1; Ref 30,32)

Anderson does not explicitly disclose wherein

- Transaction data is received from the electronic exchange where transactions are

Art Unit: 3694

conducted electronically via the Internet.

Newswire discloses "net.Genesis Corp., the leader in e-business intelligence solutions for Internet enabled and Fortune 500 enterprise." Further disclosed is the MVC segmentation package that "empowers e-businesses to quickly identify their best and worst customers." Information derived from MVC's sophisticated visitor segmentation model greatly enhances an e-business ability to gain a holistic view of their best and worst online customers." (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to include the teachings of Newswire to the disclosure of Anderson so that as e- businesses continue to proliferate, so too will the need to evaluate online sales and marketing initiatives. By utilizing Internet sales as well as traditional sales, the system of Anderson can have a more holistic view of customer purchasing information.

Re Claim 9: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the standard pricing group further comprises an aggregation of data from the set of transaction data (Column 5, lines 50-61; "Product clusters; consumer clusters.")

Re Claim 10: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the statistical analysis applied comprises at least one of a demand function analysis, a time series analysis a correlation analysis, a request for quote analysis and an auction analysis (Column 10, lines 31-53).

Re Claim 11: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses

- A communications server operable to:

Art Unit: 3694

Receive a set of transaction data from an electronic exchange (Column 2, lines 46-51);

Communicate the set of transaction data to the market analyzer (FIG 1;

24-26-30-32)

- o Receive a request for a statistical analysis of the transaction data (Column 3, lines 65-66 "Specific queries"; and

- o Communicate a set of results from the statistical analysis (Column 3, lines 67-Column 4 line 1 "Retrieve particular types of information from the relational database.")

Re Claim 12: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further

- An input interface further comprising

- o A configuration interface operable to receive configuration

- information for basing the manner in which products or services are grouped (Column 2, lines 40-55)

- o A transaction interface operable to receive the set of transaction data (FIG 1 Ref 24-26; consumer data flow); and

- o A request interface operable to receive a request (Column 3, lines 65-66 "input specific queries"); and

- An output interface operable to send a response to said request (Column 3 line 67-Column 4, line 6; "retrieve specific types of information.")

Re Claim 13: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and

Anderson further discloses comprising a configuration manager operable to select a

statistical analysis model to analyze the standard pricing group and wherein the market

Art Unit: 3694

analyzer is further operable to apply the selected statistical analysis model to the standard pricing group (Column 6, lines 36-48)

Re Claim 14: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson discloses wherein the configuration manager further comprises:

- A standard pricing group manager operable to define the standard pricing group (Column 5, lines 55-61);
- A model manager operable to define the statistical analysis applied (Column 6 lines 36-43 "Statistical extracts"; and
- A supplier manager operable to manage information regarding suppliers (FIG 1 Ref 20 and 22)

Re Claim 15: Anderson discloses the claimed system supra but does not explicitly disclose wherein the configuration manager is operable to define default values and standard parameters for the statistical analysis model. Official Notice is taken that it was notoriously old and well known in the art to provide default values for parameters in statistical models if no direct parameters are available. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include this step to Anderson so that useful data can be generated, even in the event that all necessary parameters are not known. By providing default values the user can still be presented with an estimated predictive behavior model as opposed to nothing.

Re Claim 16: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further comprises a request manager operable to: receive a request from a supplier for a set of results of the application of the statistical analysis; retrieve the set

Art Unit: 3694

of results from the database; and communicate the results to the supplier (Column 3, lines 65-Column 4 lines 6)

Re Claim 17: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the request manager is further operable to return a summary of the set of transaction data to the supplier (FIG 12(a); "Transaction Summary").

Re Claim 18: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson further discloses wherein the request manager is further operable to communicate the set of results in a format compatible with a revenue management software program (Column 4, lines 19-49; "encoding the data into digital format;" revenue management software in the form of membership cards and promotional literature such as coupons)

Re Claim 19: Anderson in view of Newswire discloses the claimed system and Anderson discloses a retrieval manager operable to retrieve the set of results from the database (Column 3 lines 65-Column 4 line 6); and an aggregation manager operable to summarize the set of transaction data (FIG 12(a); "Transaction Summary").

Re Claim 20 and 21: Anderson discloses the claimed system supra but does not explicitly disclose the steps further comprising a task manger operable to schedule the application of the statistical analysis and prompt the market analyzer to apply the statistical analysis. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to schedule the automatic generation of statistical models for a business at regular intervals so that appropriate tracking of progress and results can be

Art Unit: 3694

made. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to include these steps to Anderson so that a user can have data produced, at regular intervals that can be analyzed and compared over time, without having to continuously request this information.

Re Claims 22-30: Further method claims would have been obvious to perform from the previously rejected system claims 1-21 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Re Claims 31-36: Further system claims contain essentially the same limitations as previously rejected system claims 8, 10, 18, 20, 17 and 11 respectively and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument filed 11/06/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues in substance that the primary reference, Anderson, fails to disclose "categorize products and services from the aggregate transaction data into a standard pricing groups defined by one or more attributes and apply a statistical analysis to compare the products or services in a standard pricing group. Applicant's argument is predicated on the notion that Anderson only teaches clustering products in order to analyze customer habits. For example, a particular brand of cat food would be included in a generic cluster entitled pet foods. As such, Anderson is not concerned with the details of any particular cat food product or the comparison of any two brands of cat food, but is instead concerned with data showing that a customer does buy pet food. The examiner maintains that to the extent that the applicant tries to distinguish his

Art Unit: 3694

claimed invention over the prior art by stating what Anderson teaches and how irrelevant these teachings are to the claimed invention, the applicant fails to translate this into the claims. The examiner contends that the applicant's claims are too broad and are not patentable over Anderson. For example, the applicant contests that Anderson fails to disclose "categorize products and services from the aggregate transaction data into a standard pricing groups defined by one or more attributes." Anderson explicitly makes this disclosure on col.5 lines 55-61 i.e., By categorizing consumer retail products (hereafter "products") into product groupings referred to as product clusters and/or consumers by specific characteristics and demographics into consumer clusters, consumer buying behaviors may be identified, tracked, and employed by retailers in direct, consumer marketing as described in more detail below. The examiner further contends that it is possible that Anderson categorizes consumer products for a purpose different than applicant's. However, this reason alone would not make the claimed invention patentable over Anderson.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3694


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OJO O. OYEBISI whose telephone number is (571)272-8298. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A.M-5:30P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAMES TRAMMELL can be reached on (571)272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

O.O


ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER